

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 remain in this application. The Examiner has acknowledged that claims 10-16 and 18-25 are allowed and that claims 2-4 contain allowable subject matter but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 26-28 are new and they represent, respectively, claims 2-4 rewritten as requested by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 8, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,652,185 to Acker. The Office Action points out that in Acker a platform 56 is offset from a top of minor interior wall flaps 63. Claims 1 and 17 have been amended to indicate that hinged platforms are offset below the tops of minor interior wall flaps. The Applicant submits that this point of attachment results in a substantially different structure from that shown in Acker and believes claims 1 and 17 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 8, and 17 were further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,281,165 to Miller. Similarly to Acker, the platform 15 of Miller as pointed out in the Office Action is offset above minor interior wall flaps. Amended claims 1 and 17 are believed to be allowable over Miller for substantially the same reasons discussed above with respect to Acker.

Claim 8 is believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the reason that it depends from claim 1, an allowable base claim.

Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Acker or Miller in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,869,077 to Tuura. Claims 5 and 6 are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the reason that they depend from claim 1, which is believed to be in condition for allowance.


Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Acker or Miller in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,130,445 to Bemiss. Claim 7 is believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the reason that it depends from claim 1, which is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 8, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,349,147 to Jensen in view of either Acker or Miller. None of the applied references, either standing alone or in combination, teaches or suggests that a hinged platform is offset below a top of a minor interior wall flap as claimed in amended claim 1. Claim 1 is thus believed to be in condition for allowance and claims 8 and 9 are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the reason that they depend from claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and a requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

A check is enclosed for \$910.00 to cover the fee for additional claims as well as the fee for the concurrently filed Request for Continued Examination. The Commissioner is authorized to deduct any additional fees required (except for payment of the issue fee) from or to credit any overpayment to Jenkins & Gilchrist, P.C. Deposit Account No. 10-0447, Order No. 47088-00046

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Zachary J. Smolinski
Reg. No. 47,100
Jenkins & Gilchrist, P.C.
225 West Washington Street, Suite 2600
Chicago, IL 60606-3418
Attorneys for Applicant
Tel.: (312) 425-3900